IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEREMY FOGLEMAN, #388440

PLAINTIFF

VERSUS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:16-CV-104-LG-RHW

SHANE MICHAEL SANDRIDGE and JOHN DOES I-X

DEFENDANTS

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S LETTER MOTION [4]

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Letter Motion [4] relating to nine subpoenas, a request for a stamped file copy of his Complaint, and that his email address be added for electronic filing. The Letter Motion [4] will denied in part and is granted in part for the following reasons.

The Court finds that Plaintiff will continue to receive copies of Court Orders through the postal service addressed to Plaintiff at his last known address. Plaintiff's request to receive a copy of all filings by electronic mail is not necessary and will be denied at this time.

The Court finds that there is no statutory provision which guarantees Plaintiff a right to free copies. At this time, however, the Court will grant Plaintiff's request to receive a copy of his Complaint [1] which was filed on March 24, 2016. Plaintiff may be required in the future to prepay copies of Court documents as well as furnish a stamped self-addressed envelope so that the documents may be mailed to Plaintiff. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion [4] is granted to the extent Plaintiff will continue to receive a copy of the Court's Orders at Plaintiff's last known address through the postal service and Plaintiff's Motion [4] is denied to the extent Plaintiff is requesting that filings be delivered to him at an electronic mail address.

Case 1:16-cv-00104-LG-RHW Document 11 Filed 04/18/16 Page 2 of 2

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk mail to Plaintiff a copy of the Complaint [1]

without Plaintiff being required to prepay the cost of this copy.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's failure to advise the Court of a change of

address where he receives mail though the postal service or failure to timely comply with any

order of the Court will be deemed as a purposeful delay and contumacious act by Plaintiff and

may result in this cause being dismissed without prejudice.

THIS the 18th day of April, 2016.

s/Robert H. Walker

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2